

**REMARKS**

Amended claims 1-11 are in this application.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1-11 as presented herein are believed to satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 11<sup>1</sup> were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP3-106298 in view of Parker (U.S. Patent No. 2,632,055).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"a plurality of cabinets arranged within the frame each having an opening portion in front thereof and each adapted for accommodating one of the plurality of speaker units so that vibration plates of the plurality of speaker units are located at an internal side thereof relative to an end surface of the opening portions of the plurality of cabinets, in which said opening portion of each cabinet within the frame is arranged to face in a same direction to form a sound radiating surface; and

a projection screen . . . ,

. . . .

the projection screen is attached in a state substantially in contact with the end surface of the opening portions such that each said

---

<sup>1</sup> Note—The Examiner did not identify claims 3-6 and 11 in the listing of this 103 rejection. (See line 1 of page 3 of the present Office Action. However, since the Examiner mentioned claim 11 in the description of this 103 rejection (see line 3 of page 3 of the present Office Action), it is believed that the Examiner intended to include claims 3-6 and 11.

**opening portion of each said cabinet arranged within the frame faces the projection screen."**  
(Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that neither JP3-106298 (hereinafter, the '298 patent) nor Parker as applied by the Examiner appears to disclose the above features of claim 1. For example, neither the '298 patent nor Parker as applied by the Examiner appears to disclose a projection screen which "is attached . . . such that each said opening portion of each said cabinet arranged within the frame faces the projection screen," as in claim 1. As an example, reference is made to Figs. 7 and 8 of the present application. As illustrated therein, each speaker unit 33 has an open portion (which forms a sound radiating surface) which faces the projection screen 20. On the other hand, in the '298 patent, it appears that all of the open portions do not face the projection screen (see for example Fig. 1b thereof). Instead, some of the open portions appear to face the opposite side of where the projection screen is mounted. Additionally, Figs. 3 and 4 of Parker do not appear to disclose a projection screen. As such, Figs. 3 and 4 of Parker do not illustrate each opening portion facing "the projection screen."

Further, since the '298 patent appears to specifically disclose arranging the speakers in different arrangements such that not all of the openings for the speakers face the projection screen, it is respectfully submitted that the '298 patent effectively teaches away from arranging all of the openings for all of the speakers in a direction which faces the projection screen.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 11

be withdrawn.

Claims 3-6 are dependent from independent claim 1. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 3-6 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '298 in view of Parker as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 5-199576A.

Claim 8 is dependent from independent claim 1. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on JP 5-199576 A to overcome the above-described deficiencies of the '298 patent and Parker. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '298 in view of Parker as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of JP 5-24450A.

Claims 8-10 are dependent from independent claim 1. The Examiner does not appear to have relied on JP 5-244550 A to overcome the above-described deficiencies of the '298 patent and Parker. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the above 103 rejection of claims 8-10 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in

order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

784614\_1.DOC